[Mr. T. T. Kesavan Sastri.]

(*a*) the number of Transport buses running daily in the Trivandrum-Vizhinjam line now, and the timings of the services; and

(*b*) whether they are aware that more buses are necessary in the line?

MR. E. G. SALTER: (*a*) One.

Departure from Trivandrum.

7·20, 8·45, 10·10, 16·00, 17·30, 19·00.

Departure from Vizhinjam.

8·00, 9·25, 10·50, 16·40, 18·10, 19·50.

(*b*) Yes; but more buses cannot be provided until sufficient number of new buses are available.

Profits in the Transport Department.

383. ✻**MR. K. A. MATHEW:** Will the Government be pleased to state the amounts received by the Director of Transport in 1118 and in 1119 as his share of the profits in the respective years from the incomes of the Transport Department?

MR. E. G. SALTER: The amount received by Mr. E. G. Salter, Director of Transport as bonus for the year 1118 is Rs. 43,551-26-10. The bonus for the year 1119 has not yet been settled.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: May I know whether in addition to this amount which he got as his salary, he has been receiving a salary?

MR. E. G. SALTER: No, Sir.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: May I know the amount that he expects to realise in 1119?

PRESIDENT: What his hope is, you mean?

MR. E. G. SALTER: Rs. 64,000.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: May I know whether the terms under which has been given this will be continued in the case of his successors?

PRESIDENT: That arrangement is personal to Mr. Salter. He was brought in as an Expert and the present arrangement will not continue after Mr. Salter's term is over.

Irregularities in the Transport Department.

384. ✻**MR. K. A. MATHEW:** Will the Government bepleased to state:

(*a*) whether the Director of Transport received a complaint from Mr. K. A. Mathew, Member, Sri Mulam Assembly on 5-6-1120 that one of his subordinates accepted illicit payment from a passenger at the Trivandrum bus station and that he was a witness to it; and

(*b*) what action the Director took against the culprit?

MR. E. G. SALTER: (*a*) Yes.

(*b*) None, since enquiries showed that the man reported against was not guilty.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: May I know what investigation has been made?

MR. E. G. SALTER: Sir, I may be permitted in answer to read the reply that I sent to the complainent from the Transport Department.

> "I acknowleged receipt of your letter dated 15-7-1120. Since you are of opinion that my reply was unconvincing and unsatisfactory and since you appear to entertain some doubt in regard to the detailed investigations I have made, I am enclosing copy of a report submitted by the District Inspector. I assure you that there is no suggestion that you have made a false report, but I do suggest that the incident you witnessed gave you a wrong impression of the actual facts.
>
> I take the strongest exception to your statement that it is "widely believed that there is considerable corruption in your Department", and would suggest that before making such a statement, you would be well advised to produce proof rather than endeavour to dam the many hundreds of employees in this Department without giving them an opportunity to defend themselves.
>
> I note your suggestion.....

PRESIDENT: I do not think you need go further.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: May I know whether the complainnant was asked to come to the office and confront the culprit directly to ascertain whether the incident reported was a fact?

MR. E. G. SALTER: The investigations that were made satisfied me that Mr. Mathew was under a misapprehension and I told him so. He was not prepared to believe me, but stated that he would take the matter before the Dewan, a procedure which I welcome, but he did not see it fit to take up.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: Is it a fair inquiry if the complainnant is not given the opportunity of confronting the culprit?

MR. E. G. SALTER: In disciplinary enquiry in organisations such as the Transport Department they are obviously not of a judicial character, it is left to the integrity and finding of the Head of the Department whether or not he accepts the evidence.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: Is not the integrity of the complainent taken into consideration?

MR. E. G. SALTER: It was never questioned.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: Should he not be offered an opportunity to prove the allegation?

MR. E. G. SALTER: Since the complainant took no further action on the explanation given by the Department, it was considered that the matter was at an end.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: Will a private enquiry satisfy an incident of this kind when it is specifically pointed out that a particular individual was corrupt?

MR. E. G. SALTER: The enquiry conducted by the Head of the Department satisfied the Head of the Department.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: Will it satisfy the public?

PRESIDENT: Order, order. If anybody was dissatisfied with the decision of the Head of the Department obviously the proper procedure could and should have been to have brought the matter befor

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[President.]

the Government. Was that step taken? That is the point. Mr. Salter says he has conducted a certain kind of enquiry. Assuming that it was ex-parte and a completely prejudicial enquiry, on which he came to a wrong conclusion, the procedure of course was that the Government should have been approached and it should have been pointed out to them that Mr. Salter's enquiry was perfunctory. Government would have then taken action in time. In the absence of any such appeal, I do not think that any more question could arise.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: Often it is stated that cases of corruption may be brought to the notice of the Head of the Departments. We honestly try to do so but if the officials hold a hide-and-seek enquiry against what we have already gone into, the position becomes invidious.

PRESIDENT: Order, order. I am glad that the question has been raised. Speaking for myself, I fully welcome and shall welcome all complaints against subordinates of Departments or even Heads of Departments, being brought forward by responsible men whenever the latter consider that a case is provable. If, for instance, the immediate superior of a particular officer does not in the opinion of the honourable members or the complainant as the case may be, deal with the case fairly, the complainant will go to the Head of the Department If the Head of the Department has not dealt with the case fairly, the complainant will go to the Government, but I am strongly of the opinion that if an honourable member has a grievance and he thinks that the grievance has not been properly investigated but drops the matter and raises it in the House subsequently, that is not fair. I would strongly urge that it is only after all the possible recourses are had and all possible appeals are exhausted, that the honourable members should or might say that the Government do not really wish that these complaints or these enquiries should be made.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: Thank you, Sir, we will try to place it before the Head of the administration, if the method of enquiry adopted by the Head of the Department is not satisfactory.

Transport bus service.

385. *MR. K. A. MATHEW: Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) the quantity of petrol consumed by the State Transport bus for a trip from Kottayam to Kottarakara;

(*b*) the total consumption of petrol in the month of Medom 1120 by the shuttle service between Kottarakara and Kottayam;

(*c*) the number of buses running daily between Kottayam and Kottarakara;

(*d*) the number of passengers served daily (on an average) between the two points;

(*e*) what was the quota of buses received last and how many of these were sent to Nagercoil line and to Kottayam-Kottarakara line; and

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly